



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/994,520	11/26/2001	Scott Lochner	07326-002003	1263
20985	7590	06/22/2005	EXAMINER	
FISH & RICHARDSON, PC 12390 EL CAMINO REAL SAN DIEGO, CA 92130-2081			DINH, DUC Q	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2674	

DATE MAILED: 06/22/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/994,520

Applicant(s)

LOCHNER ET AL.

Examiner

DUC Q. DINH

Art Unit

2674

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 April 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 2-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 2-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant's election without traverse of Group I, claims 2-21, in the Response to the Restriction Requirement filed on April 07, 2005, is acknowledged.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3. Claims 14 and 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Claim 14 recites the limitation "a second processing unit, physically separated from data entry part...". Although the specification does mention that the system can include a plurality of input/output unit 2 (page 13, line 23 – page 4, line 6), there is no support for the second processing unit as recited in claim 14.

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 14 and 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph

Claim 14 recites the limitation "a second processing unit" in line 1-2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

The examiner examines the application based on best understood of the claimed language.

Drawings

5. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the “a second processing unit” must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as “amended.” If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either “Replacement Sheet” or “New Sheet” pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

6. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(4) because reference character “72” has been used to designate both the CPU and transceiver. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is

Art Unit: 2674

being amended. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 2-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Taaffe et al. (U. S. Patent No. 5,046,027), hereinafter Taaffe, in view of Zook et al. (4,850,009), hereinafter Zook.

In reference to claim 2, Taaffe discloses in Fig. 1, system for processing and display images comprising first part (a first housing) having a monitor 23 with an data entry part (a display and keyboard) and communication lines 21 and 31 for communicating information, and a second part (a second housing) 17 and 33, separate from first part, including communication lines 21 and 31, adapted to connect with first part to exchange information, the second part including a image processor (video generation element) which produces a video output including at least on synchronization signal, and sending the video output to the first housing to drive said

Art Unit: 2674

display part to display information based on video output with at least on synchronization signal (Fig. 1, col. 13-52). Taaffe discloses everything except that wireless transceivers are used for communication between first and second part. Zook discloses a communication system using wireless transceiver for communicating between a portable handheld and a base station (see Fig. 4, col. 7-30).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to substitute the wireless transceiver of Zook for the LAN connection of Taaffe for doing away with the need for any interconnecting lines for user's convenience (col. 3, lines 11-20).

In reference to claims 3-5 and 7, Taaffe discloses the display controller 25 output a single standard analog video signal plus synchronization signals (col. 6, lines 44-51).

In reference to claim 6, Zook discloses the RF transceiver arrangement including modem 79 and antenna 80 for communicating with the RF transceiver on the handheld 20.

In reference to claim 8, Taaffe discloses the video output includes an RGB signal (col. 6, lines 15-31).

In reference to claims 10-11, Taaffe discloses the process to send only new picture information representing change in a displayed image. If the image which is desired to be processed is currently displayed on only one partition of a monitor 23 (as opposed to a full screen display) and other images which are not to be changed are displayed in the remaining partition of the monitor 23, then the other images must be preserved in the image display controller switching process as discloses in column 10, lines 20-43.

Art Unit: 2674

In reference to claim 12, see the rejection as applied to claim 2. In addition, Taaffe discloses second work station 15 having display part monitor 23 in Fig. 1a, corresponding to the third housing including data entry part and data communication part as claimed.

In reference to claim 13, refer to the rejection as applied to claims 2 and 10-11.

In reference to claim 14, refer to the rejections as applied to claim 12.

In reference to claim 15-17, refer to the rejection as applied to claims 3-5.

In reference to claim 18, refer to the rejection as applied to claim 6.

In reference to claim 20, refer to the rejection as applied to claim 1.

9. Claims 9 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Taaffe and Zook in view of Pfeiffer et al (U. S. Patent No. 5,129,060).

In reference to claim Taaffe and Zook discloses everything except the parallel signal is converted into serial signal, which is transmitted by the video processor to the display. Pfeiffer et al. discloses a high-speed image processing computer having a video processor 106 for converting parallel data into serial data and transfer it to the display device.

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to learn the teaching of Pfeiffer et al., i.e.: convert parallel signal data to serial signal data, in the system of Taaffe and Zook for providing high speed serial image data for the image display system (see abstract).

Art Unit: 2674


Conclusion

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DUC Q DINH whose telephone number is (571) 272-7686. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri from 8:00.AM-4:00.PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Edouard Patrick can be reached on (571) 272-7603. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

DUC Q DINH
Examiner
Art Unit 2674


REGINA LIANG
PRIMARY EXAMINER

DQD
June 17, 2005